<center>**Remarks**</center>

1.   Summary of the Office Action

In the office action mailed August 16, 2007, the Examiner objected to the title as being allegedly non-descriptive, and the Examiner objected to claim 21 for including a comma where the Examiner felt the claim should include a semicolon.

In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 11-21, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,292,656 (Donovan), the Examiner rejected claims 9-10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Donovan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,963,583 (Foti), and the Examiner rejected claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Donovan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,195,425 (Farris).

2.   Status of the Claims

Applicant has amended the independent claims to add that the call setup request from the service node includes the calling number, the called number, *and* the non-loop parameter, to make clear that the non-loop parameter is not merely the calling number or the called number, and further to add that the non-loop parameter is included to indicate that call setup signaling has already occurred to the service node so as to help avoid endless looping of call setup signaling to the service node.

Pending are claims 1-25, of which claims 1, 14, and 21 are independent and the remainder are dependent.

3.   Response to Title Objection

The Examiner objected to the title as being allegedly non-descriptive, and the Examiner suggested instead the title: Method and System for Processing a Call of the Pre-Paid Services.

<center>9</center>

Applicant respectfully disagrees that the title is non-descriptive. The title accurately describes that the claimed invention relates to preventing endless looping during call setup.

Further, Applicant submits that the Examiner's proposed title is overly narrow and, at the same time, is itself non-descriptive. It is overly narrow because it focuses on pre-paid call setup, while the claimed invention is not necessarily limited to application in the pre-paid call setup context (but is useful in that context). It is non-descriptive because it does not say anything about avoiding endless looping during call setup. Moreover, the proposed title refers to "the pre-paid call services" but does provide antecedent basis for that term, so the proposed title would leave open the question of *which* pre-paid call services.

For all of these reasons, Applicant submits the title should remain as currently written, and Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the objection.

4.   Response to Claim Objection

The Examiner objected to claim 21 on grounds that the claim included a comma before the "wherein" clause and because the Examiner considers a semi-colon to be more appropriate at that point in the claims. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Semicolons separate the list of elements following the pre-amble. The comma precedes a wherein clause element that further defines one or more aspects of the claim. This punctuation is commonplace and acceptable in a patent claim. Therefore, Applicant requests the Examiner to withdraw this objection.

5.   Response to Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected each independent claim as being allegedly anticipated by Donovan. In so rejecting the claims, however, the Examiner did not make out a clear case of where in Donovan the claimed invention is allegedly disclosed. The Examiner cited to various portions of Donovan, but in many instances the Examiner seems to have over-generalized the

10

disclosure of Donovan in an effort to support a conclusion that Donovan teaches the claimed invention. For instance, the Examiner referred to the text at column 2, lines 37-50, of Donovan in an apparent effort to establish that Donovan teaches including a non-loop parameter in a request. A review of that portion of Donovan, however, reveals no disclosure of a non-loop parameter. Similarly, the Examiner cited that same portion of Donovan as allegedly teaching the claimed signaling with an SCP. However, a review of that portion of Donovan again fails to reveal any such disclosure.

If the Examiner feels that Donovan teaches the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully invites the Examiner to point out in greater detail and clarity where the Examiner finds a teaching of the claimed invention.

As far as Applicant can tell, it seems that the Examiner might have broadly construed the term "non-loop parameter" in a manner that does not relate to avoiding call setup looping. To avoid this apparently overbroad interpretation of the claims, Applicant has amended the claims to make clear that the non-loop parameter is included to indicate that call setup signaling has already occurred to the service node and thus to help avoid endless looping of call setup signaling to the service node. Further, to avoid interpretation of the non-loop parameter as being merely the calling number or the called number, Applicant has amended the claims to recite that the request includes (i) the calling number, (ii) the called number, *and* (iii) the non-loop parameter.

Donovan fails to mention anything about avoiding call setup looping and therefore fails to mention anything about a non-loop parameter. Consequently, Donovan fails to anticipate the independent claims. Applicant therefore submits that the independent claims are allowable. Further, without conceding the other assertions by the Examiner, Applicant submits that the

11

dependent claims are allowable for at least the reason that they depend from the allowable independent claims.

For these reasons, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and allowance of the claims.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss this invention with the undersigned, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (312) 913-2141.

Respectfully submitted,

McDONNELL BOEHNEN
HULBERT & BERGHOFF LLP

Dated: November 15, 2007   By: /Lawrence H. Aaronson/
                                                  Lawrence H. Aaronson
                                                  Reg. No. 35,818

12